

Applicant : Robert M. Ayers
Serial No. : 09/639,582
Filed : August 14, 2000
Page : 8 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-367001 / P342

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 4 and replaces the original sheet containing Figure 4.

In Figure 4, two interior boxes 434 have been added.

Attachments following the last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page)

Annotated sheet showing changes (1 page)

REMARKS

Claims 15-32 are pending in the present application. Claims 15-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft PowerPoint 2000, Copyright 1987-1999 Microsoft Corporation, in view of Wu et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,542,629 B1 ("Wu '629").

Additionally, Figure 2 is rejected because, "[i]t appears that the replacement of figure 2 is not proper since figure 2 is prior art, not the present invention whereas the purpose of the replacement is to clarify the features of the claimed invention."

The applicant has amended independent claims 15 and 24. No new matter has been added by way of this amendment. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of these amendments and the following remarks.

1. 103(a) rejection of claims 15-32

Independent claims 15 and 24 have been amended such that "the exterior bounding box having one or more dimensions that are variable" has become an "exterior bounding box having one or more variable dimensions that have an undefined size specification." Additionally, "converting the one or more variable dimensions of the exterior bounding box into one or more fixed dimensions" has been clarified so that the converting results in "fixed dimensions, each having an undefined size specification."

The applicant respectfully submits that this amendment clarifies claims 15 and 24 to overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections. The previous wording of the second indented clause in claims 15 and 24 recited "converting ... variable dimensions ... into fixed dimensions." In rejecting claims 15 and 24, the Examiner made reference to the second indented clause of both claims and relied upon Page 4 of the Powerpoint reference by stating, "a user can convert a size for each variable dimension to a fixed size by entering a desired number in the height box or the width box." The Powerpoint reference does not, however, disclose an undefined size specification in one or more variable dimensions, nor does it disclose converting one or more variable dimensions with undefined size specifications into one or more fixed

dimensions with defined size specifications. Rather, the PowerPoint reference discloses one or more variable dimensions with pre-determined defined size specifications (Powerpoint, page 3-4) that can be converted by the user into other dimensions with defined size specifications.

Furthermore, the Examiner's reliance on Wu '629 as the second reference in the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection to all of the pending claims in this application is misplaced. Wu '629 is directed toward a "method and apparatus for preventing or inhibiting effective reproduction of documents such as currency, checks, stock certificates, and any other printed document including a pre-defined security mask printed therein." The present invention is directed toward "a page layout template having a plurality of dimension including one or more variable dimensions." The field of Wu '629 is diametrically opposed to the field of the present invention: the goal of Wu '629 is to prevent or inhibit exact replication and allow one to distinguish copies from an original; in contrast, the goal of the present invention is to allow easy creation and replication of documents in a variety of formats. One skilled in the art of page layout templates would have no motivation to combine a technique from the field of Wu '629. Furthermore, Wu '629 is directed towards printed documents containing pre-defined security masks, which by definition, have fixed dimensions with defined size specifications. The present invention requires at least one variable dimension with an undefined size specification. Thus, in addition to belonging to a different field, Wu '629 cannot be combined with the PowerPoint reference to anticipate the present invention because Wu '629 teaches away from the present invention.

Claims 16-23 are dependent upon Claim 15. Claims 25-32 are dependent upon Claim 24. Accordingly, in light of the amendments to Claims 15 and 24 and the arguments above, the applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections of Claims 15-32 have been overcome.

2. 103(a) Rejection of Claims 19, 21-23, 28, and 30-32

Claim 19 recites a special case of adjusting the metrics of the interior boxes, which includes the use of synthesized metrics. The claim defines a synthesized metric as "a metric that

is adjusted after content has been flowed into the interior box.” In rejecting Claim 19, the Examiner relied upon the PowerPoint reference (pages 5-6).

The applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s reliance upon the PowerPoint reference is misplaced. Specifically, if resizing a PowerPoint page template satisfies claim 19, then the interior boxes containing a synthesized metric would not resize themselves until after content was flowed. PowerPoint does not disclose waiting until after content is flowed to resize interior boxes having synthesized metrics. Furthermore, as argued above, none of the slides in the PowerPoint reference teach a page template with a variable dimension having an undefined size specification.

In order for the PowerPoint reference to satisfy the limitations of claim 19, at least one of the initial variable dimensions of the PowerPoint template would need to have an undefined size specification prior to conversion between variable and fixed dimensions. Then, upon conversion between variable dimensions and fixed dimensions, any interior boxes with a synthesized metric would need to terminate adjustment in the dimension of the synthesized metric and would not resize until after content was flowed. The PowerPoint reference does not disclose termination of synthesized metric adjustment in response to a changed page template until after content is flowed. Rather, slides 4-6 and slides 13-15 of the PowerPoint reference depict PowerPoint interior boxes resizing immediately in response to a change in template size or reference distances prior to the addition of content to the page template. Thus, “synthesized metrics” are not taught by the PowerPoint reference.

Claims 21-23, 28, and 30-32 all recite a “synthesized metric” in the same manner as claim 19. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that the additional arguments presented in support of claim 19 overcome the Examiner’s rejections to those claims as well.

3. Rejection of Figure 2

In the action, the Examiner acknowledged that the amendment to Figure 2, filed on June 11, 2004, was entered on August 11, 2004, when the Request for Continuing Examination was filed. However, the Examiner maintains that the replacement of Figure 2 is not proper because

the figure is directed to prior art. The applicant respectfully disagrees. While it is true that the amendment occurs in a drawing labeled "prior art," it is not necessarily the case that an amendment to the prior art description in a patent specification would not also clarify the features of the claimed invention. In this case, the amendment to the drawing is properly located in the prior art drawing because the amendment added line boxes 234, which are described in the background section at lines 18-21 of page 1.

However, to clarify that the features added to Figure 2 are relevant to both the prior art and the present invention, Figure 4 has been amended in a similar manner. Specifically, Figure 4 now depicts interior boxes 434 included within an interior level much as Figure 2 was previously amended to show line boxes 234 within sibling box 204.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to enter the amendment of Figure 4 and submits that the Examiner's rejection of Figure 2 has been overcome by the present amendment.


Applicant : Robert M. Ayers
Serial No. : 09/639,582
Filed : August 14, 2000
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-367001 / P342

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 22 July 05


Hans R. Troesch
Reg. No. 36,950

Customer No. 021876
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50286589.doc




FIG. 4